

# MANITOBA'S RIGHTS IGNORED

---

Lands Withheld, Boundaries Restricted

---

SPEECH BY

**HON. ROBERT ROGERS**

Minister of Public Works

in the Provincial Legislature

February, 23, 1906

---

*Gov. Sec.  
Man.  
Pub. Works  
C. 2*

PRESS OF THE WINNIPEG TELEGRAM

CATALOGUED

# *Manitoba's Rights Ignored*

## *Lands Withheld, Boundaries Restricted*

*Speech delivered by Hon. Robert Rogers, Minister of  
Public Works, in the Provincial Legislature  
February 23rd, 1906.*

Hon. Robert Rogers had the floor in the legislature on Friday. He spoke for nearly two hours, and covered a range of subjects which at the present moment are of intense interest to Manitoba. Mr. Rogers' speech was forceful and effective, particularly in his presentation of the local government's case in the matter of swamp lands, in his exposition of Manitoba's claims to extension of her boundaries, and in his vigorous treatment of the decadence of the Canadian judiciary.

He made it clear that the Dominion government is committed to a policy of antagonism to this province, and he made clear also the reason, which is nothing more or less than the federal ministry's desire to force separate schools upon Manitoba, under threat of refusing her natural and obvious claims to territorial expansion. What the local government's next step in this important question will be Mr. Rogers did not indicate, but he made it known that there will be no truckling to Ottawa.

Mr. Rogers exploded an oft repeated charge that the Roblin government sold 256,000 acres of Hudson's Bay land at \$1.50 per acre. "The simple fact is," said the Minister, "that the province of Manitoba never owned 256,000 acres, and therefore could not possibly sell them." The reason Manitoba did not own the lands, he explained, was due to the improvident bargain made by the Greenway government.

Manitobans will learn with anything but satisfaction that the Dominion government is taking revenues from public lands which rightly belong to this province, and notice has been served on the lands department by the minister of justice, that Manitoba must not accept one dollar of revenue from these lands.

Mr. Rogers frankly admitted that there had been some slight increase in civil administration. One reason was the growth of the province, entailing more administrative work, the other was the expense incurred by the attorney-general's department in prosecuting the crooks who operated in the late federal elections.

### **An Easy Task**

Hon. Robert Rogers, resuming the debate on the budget said:

Mr. Speaker—Seldom, if ever, has it been my privilege and my pleasure to ask your attention and the attention of the members of this house where the task before me was more easy than the one which presents itself this afternoon. It is easy, Mr. Speaker, in the first place because of the fact that my hon. friend, the provincial treasurer, in his magnificent budget speech, which he delivered to the house on Wednesday last, was able to make a statement of the affairs of the province so clear, so full and so complete that there is really nothing left for me to add, and I am sure it would be impossible for any hon. member of this house to undertake to supplement or add anything to that statement in order that it could be made more clear, as to the financial position of the province in which we live than it was left by my friend the provincial treasurer when he resumed his seat. My task is further made easy by the speech of my friend the leader of the opposition, a speech which was very moderate, very calm, very mild and indeed very fair. I would like to take this, the first opportunity, of extending to my friend, my deep feelings of sympathy in the position which he occupied, because let me say this, that no matter how

willing he may have been, no matter how anxious he may have been, no matter how able he might be it would be impossible for him, or any other gentleman, either inside the house or outside, to stand up here and successfully controvert the statements and the facts laid down in the budget speech.

#### **Accepts the Challenge**

My task is again still further made easy, and more than that it is made pleasant, in view of the fact that my old friend, the Free Press, in its issue of yesterday, was good enough to throw out a challenge or intimation that the time had arrived when the house and the country should either hear from my hon. friend the attorney-general or myself with respect to matters in dispute between the people of this province and the government at Ottawa. Let me say at once that I am at home six days in the week, 52 weeks in the year, and am only too glad to accept any challenge that can be thrown out by my friend the Free Press, to discuss any question which affects the administration of the affairs of the province in which we live, and I trust I may be able to gratify the request as made in the Free Press in its issue of yesterday, before I resume my seat this afternoon.

However, before undertaking to deal with that matter I desire to ask your attention while I devote a little time, and I trust some respect to my friend, the leader of the opposition. Let me say that in so far as the general remarks of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition are concerned, I have very little fault to find. I was amused, however, at his effort to establish, if he possibly could, the fact that some credit was due to the government of which he was so long a member, for the splendid showing and the financial position laid down by the provincial treasurer. In other words he claimed that the administration of our predecessors was entitled to some credit for the magnificent showing which my friend the provincial treasurer is able to present today.

While he made this statement he utterly failed, in my opinion, to show to this house, and to the people of the country, where the government of our predecessors have been entitled to a single, solitary, tittle of credit for the surplus shown. (Applause.)

#### **Only Six New Licenses**

The leader of the opposition was good enough to say that of course we were entitled to all the credit of having raised by way of taxation on corporations and railways in this province, nearly half a million dollars. He went on to acknowledge that we were entitled to some

credit with respect to the increased fees of liquor licenses, although he said it was due in a great measure to the increase in the number of licenses. I may tell him that the increase in licenses in 1905 was simply six in number over that of 1904. This may be a surprise to my friend, the leader of the opposition and the gentleman opposite who have had so much to say with respect to the large number of licenses issued during the past year. However this is a question that will be dealt with later on, and it is not necessary for us to go into it in details today.

#### **A Surprising Statement**

The most surprising statement made by my friend the leader of the opposition was with respect to the provincial lands of this province, and I am glad that he has been pleased to rise in his place today to take this, his first opportunity, to apologize to this house and to the country for some of the mis-statements which he had the misfortune to make yesterday and statements made, no doubt, by him in error. I want to say in fairness to my friend that I am sure he would not rise in his place to make a statement if he did not believe it to be true. I am willing to acknowledge that in my judgment and in my opinion he is much too honest a man to do anything of that sort. However, for reasons best known to himself, he was led into making the mis-statements for which he has just now been good enough to apologize. Let me say that the unfortunate part is that in making the official statement he did yesterday he has taken the records of the Dominion government. No doubt he has taken the official orders in council as published in the official Canada Gazette, and there he thought he found we had received 414,000 acres of swamp lands since we came into power in 1900.

My friend is willing to acknowledge that he was mistaken in this, but I think he should have gone a little further and said that he was prepared to join with the government and the members on this side of the house, that we have just cause for grievance in complaining of the attitude and the actions of the Dominion government in failing to give us the grants of swamp lands to which we are entitled. (Applause.)

I can understand my friend making this mistake from the figures which they sent out, leaving the impression that they had given 414,000 acres, when as a matter of fact, and I regret to have to correct my hon. friend even in the statement he has just made, we only received 200,169 acres. He has evidently been misled

again by his calculation from the official organ of the Dominion government. Not only that, but in order that I may show to this house and the people of the country how anxious the Dominion government is to punish the people of this province,

I want to draw the attention of my friend, the leader of the opposition, to the fact that not only have they refused to transfer us this land, although we have reason to expect it from their own order-in-council two or three years ago, they still hold it and it will be interesting to the house, and my friend, the leader of the opposition, to know that notice was served on the public lands department by no less a person than the minister of justice, which notice was to the effect that the province of Manitoba and the lands department must be very careful not to accept one dollar of revenue even for hay permits or for timber dues and in the meantime the Dominion government is accepting money which should properly go into the treasury of this province.

#### An Unfair Comparison

I want my friend to take note of this, and surely I will not appeal to him in vain, and to rise in his place and say that he is willing to join with the government of the day in pleading with the government at Ottawa that some measure of justice may be done, and that the little province of Manitoba may be recognized at all events as having some rights in the small matter of the hay permits and timber dues. My friend's calculation as to the average price of land sold by the government is very misleading. He undertook to establish that we were getting but very little more for our land at the present time than was being received during the regime of the government of which he was a member. Let me say this, and here we have another evidence of the anxiety of our friends at Ottawa to punish the people of this province, that the present minister of justice holds that the only swamp lands to which we are entitled, and which are to be handed over to the government, must be submerged lands. Is it a fair comparison to compare the value of submerged land with the value of land such as is sold by the Canadian Pacific railway, the Hudson's Bay company, or any other corporation in this country?

#### Land Under Water

Such is the interpretation as placed by the minister of justice. Let me again ask my friend the leader of the opposition, if land under water in this province is worth more today than in 1899. That is the question he

should ask himself. In order to make a favorable comparison he undertakes to include 250,000 acres of land which is commonly known as Hudson's Bay land, and he charges the government of today with having sold it at \$1.50 per acre.

I want to say to this house and the people of the country, and I wish it to be well understood, that when any member of this house, or any gentleman outside, on any platform, undertakes to say that the province of Manitoba and the government of the day, have sold 250,000 acres of Hudson's Bay land at \$1.50 per acre, he makes a statement absolutely incorrect, and not in accordance with fact. (Hear, hear.) The simple fact is that the province of Manitoba never owned 250,000 such acres, and therefore could not possibly sell them. The reason we did not own the land is owing to the bargain made by Mr. Greenway.

#### Would Take Twenty Years

I hold in my hand a copy of the agreement made by the Greenway government and the Lake Manitoba and Canal company, and it is distinctly therein laid down that we have no title and could get no title to this acreage as referred to by the leader of the opposition. Here is the agreement:

The company further expressly agrees with the government that the company will from and out of any land grant that may be earned in respect of the portion of the line of railway herein agreed to be aided cause to be assigned or transferred to the government all the right title and interest in and right to patents for two hundred and fifty-six thousand acres of land in the province of Manitoba, which shall be fairly fit for settlement, a portion of such land grant to be selected therefrom by the government by alternate odd numbered sections in the odd numbered townships and odd numbered ranges, COMMENCING AT THE SOUTH-EASTERN ODD NUMBERED TOWNSHIP OF SUCH LAND GRANT, thence westerly along the southern tier of townships, thence easterly along the third tier of townships, and so on northward, until the said two hundred and fifty-six thousand acres, fairly fit for settlement, have been selected, BUT NOT TO INCLUDE ANY PORTION OF THE ORIGINAL LAND GRANT TO THE COMPANY, AS SCHEDULED BY ORDER - IN - COUNCIL BEARING DATE 6TH DAY OF JUNE, 1892, OR ANY LAND SOLD IN THE ORDINARY COURSE OF BUSINESS TO INTENDING OR ACTUAL SETTLERS, and such land when transferred to the government shall be accepted by the government in satisfaction of any claim which the government may have against the Winnipeg & Hudson Bay Railway & Steamship company, or the Winnipeg Great Northern railway, or against the property and assets of such

companies, or either of them, or shall, at the request of the contractors, assign to contractors, or to whom they may appoint the claim and demand of the province of Manitoba as against the said railway companies, or either of them in this clause mentioned and any security hold in respect thereof, and it is herein agreed that as to the part of the company's lines beyond the said eighty miles, the guarantee in this contract provided for shall not, if so decided by the government, come into force, until the company have satisfied the government that by the construction of the line of railway hereby agreed to be aided such land grant shall be earned, and that the company shall be in such a position on said line being built to assign and transfer the same as above mentioned.

We observe, Mr. Speaker, that the agreement provides that such land when transferred to the government shall be accepted by the government in satisfaction of any claim. It was impossible for us to get a transfer until the same was surveyed. We undertook as best we could to secure a title. When we came into office we found that before we could get a title it was necessary to have the lands surveyed. Our late lamented J. A. Davidson, provincial treasurer, and minister of the public lands department, went to a great deal of trouble. He went twice to Ottawa and interviewed the minister of the interior. I went with him in the winter of 1902, and we had an interview with the minister of the interior, and we pleaded for a survey as soon as possible in order to get a title to the acreage named in the agreement. Our request was promised favorable consideration, but we waited until 1902 and 1903 and 1904—there was no sign of a single solitary surveyor going out. It would take at the rate the government is making surveys, at least fifty years before it was possible to secure a title to the land in question.

#### Outside the Fact

Therefore when any member of this house undertakes to tell the people of the country that we have sold land at \$1.56 per acre they make a statement that is not in accordance with fact. (Applause.) We have not been able to get the land for the simple reason that we could not get it surveyed, and that is the reason we were obliged to make the arrangement we did with respect to the Hudson Bay lands. For example, during the very best year that ever was it has been apparently impossible for the Dominion government to even survey one acre of swamp land for this province. My friend went on to deal with the Manitoba and

Northwestern lands, and he felt here that there was some little comfort for the policy of the government of which he was a member. My friend, the provincial treasurer was generous enough to give some credit in this regard. It is true that we are going to come out of this transaction without any loss, and I hope with some profit. Let me ask my friend if this condition of affairs is due to the administration of the government of which he was a member. Why, then Mr. Greenway made the bargain with the Manitoba and Northwest railway he had a scheme, as he called it, of his own. What was he going to do with it? He was going to advertise the land in the United States and Eastern Canada, and I understand also that he was going to employ auctioneers to sell at the upset price of three dollars per acre.

#### Sales by Auctioneers

We had some experience about that time with sales of land in this province by auctioneers. Unfortunately for the province the Dominion government selected certain auctioneers to go out and sell some school lands of ours. What was done? As a result of the sales what did we find—not of our own finding, but of the finding of the friends of the gentlemen opposite who were so ashamed of themselves that they appointed a commission to investigate the sales? The report that was brought in went to show that MANY THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN PAID TO THE CREDIT OF THE SCHOOL LAND FUND OF MANITOBA WERE SQUANDERED AND GIVEN BACK TO POLITICAL FRIENDS AS A RESULT OF THE CROOKED SALES EFFECTED. Do you mean to tell me that if a policy of this kind had been carried out in this regard that we would have the magnificent showing which the provincial treasurer is able to show today with respect to the sale and administration of the northwest lands?

#### A Generous Statement

There is more than this. My friend the provincial treasurer was so generous in his statement that he overlooked to tell the house and the leader of the opposition that when we came into power we found this bargain as made by Mr. Greenway with respect to the Manitoba and Northwest lands in the shape that we did not hold a single acre. We could not get a title until we had paid the Dominion government 10 cents per acre for the survey, which amounted to some \$54,000, and in addition to this, as a result of the bargain, the Greenway government undertook to relieve the company from taxation until the

year 1910 when the bonds became due. My friend the leader of the opposition was proud at the opening of this session to say that the northern portion of the province was more fertile and productive than any other part. What does this mean and prove? It proves that the government of Mr. Norquay made a contract with the Manitoba and S.W. Railway company and gave them \$700,000 worth of bonds similar to those given for the construction of the north-western railway.

#### The Facts Today

What are the facts today? You have only to turn to the public accounts for the last few years and there you will find that we collected year by year the sum of \$10,000 for taxes on the Manitoba and S.W. railway. If the northwest portion of the province is so much more fertile than the southern portion as my friend the leader of the opposition would have us believe, what amount should we be collecting today? We would be collecting at least \$10,000 a year. These however, are side issues.

#### Figures for Purposes

My friend went on to deal with the case of civil government. He undertook by a statement which he submitted to the house to establish the fact that civil government was costing more today than it did in 1899. I am free to acknowledge that in this my friend was undoubtedly correct. I have not had time to examine his figures, but I am satisfied that he would not make a statement if he did not believe it to be true. But if I had time I would be curious enough to examine that statement, and see how it compared with the old figures which were published by the Liberal party in 1899 and sent broadcast up and down the country to show how cheaply the affairs of this province were being administered by the government of that time. (Laughter.)

#### Careful Leaving Out

Take, for example, the department over which I have the honor to preside. The statement was sent out to the people of this country that that department was being managed at a cost of \$5,000 or \$6,000, but in order to arrive at that conclusion they were careful to leave out the salaries of the most important officials of the department. It is easy to make statements of this kind, but I do not think my friend the leader of the opposition would intentionally mislead. The fact remains, however, that the cost of civil government is undoubtedly greater today than it was in 1899. And necessarily so because of the great advancement that

has taken place up and down the country.

#### Some Serious Crimes

The leader of the opposition went on to make further comparisons, and named the department of the attorney-general. I think he referred to the fact that a large increase had taken place in the cost of administration of that department. I stand here to say to my friend, the leader of the opposition, to the house, and to the people of the country, that

**I would not be at all surprised to learn that the cost of the administration of justice in Manitoba was larger during the year 1905 than during any previous year in the history of the province. Let me tell you the reason why. One of the reasons is due to the fact that in the year 1904 we had a Dominion election covering the province of Manitoba, and as a result of that election the attorney-general and the government of the province felt called upon to bring to what we thought justice men who had been guilty of the most serious crimes which had ever been committed within the four corners of the province.**

#### Reasons for Failure

It is true you tell us we did not succeed. That was not our fault. We were able to establish that men in this province had been guilty of taking away the rights of the citizens of the country who had been here for twenty and thirty years. They had deprived them of their dearest rights, their franchise. Although we went before the courts of this country and established the guilt of the individuals, yet it is true we failed to get a conviction. I want to draw the attention of the house to the reasons why we failed in this matter. We were there with our case before a judge of this province, and we were able to prove that certain individuals were guilty of mutilating lists and taking away the liberties and the franchises of hundreds of our best and oldest citizens. Notwithstanding the fact that we established a case in every sense before the court we failed to get a conviction.

#### The Bar of Justice

I want to draw the attention of the members of the house to a copy of one of the lists to which I refer, in order that they may understand it. I fancy almost every member has seen a copy, but I want them to look at it again and again in order that they may understand the full effect and meaning of the position which we were in.

**Here is a list containing 155 names, and forty-two suffered from the effects of the thin red line. Although we were able to find the men who were guilty and able to**

bring them to what we thought was the bar of justice, we did not succeed. Why? Because we found there a partisan judge, who was willing to say, and who did say, that it was not an offence against the criminal code of the country in which we live. ("Shame.") I ask you who ever heard of such a finding as that, and that is what we are up against.

#### The Judge's Directions

What happened? This learned judge was afraid no doubt of the jury, and he at once took upon himself the responsibility of instructing them that they must bring in a verdict of not guilty. That was the reason why we did not succeed in bringing these criminals to justice. Let me say more. It is an unfortunate fact, but nevertheless true, that the bar of the province of Manitoba is not the only bar in the Dominion that has been tainted by partisan judges. Take the last session of the parliament of Canada, when legislation was introduced with respect to the judges of our country. What does that legislation contain? It provides that no judge mentioned in this act shall either directly or indirectly act as director or manager of any corporation, but devote himself exclusively to his judicial duties. To read such a clause you would think that the duties and responsibilities of the judges and the judiciary of Canada were defined by parliament. But what do we find? We find certain judges up and down the country acting in defiance of the law, and openly continuing their positions on companies and corporations.

#### Mutual Back Scratching

What reason do they give? Simply because they recognize and realize that they are protected by the government at Ottawa, and they tell us, at all events it has been said, that that legislation did not mean anything, because there is no penalty clause attached. In other words THERE SEEMS TO BE AN UNWRITTEN UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE POWERS THAT BE AT OTTAWA AND SOME OF THE JUDICIARY, that "You scratch my back and I'll scratch yours," and for Liberal heelsers to mutilate our lists after the fashion of the one which I have presented to your notice. (Laughter and applause.) That is the simple condition of things which exists in the country today, so far as the judiciary is concerned. We have evidence of this, not alone in Manitoba, but we have it in Ontario, where a short time ago two learned judges were selected as a commission to investigate most serious charges. They brought in a finding which is, no doubt, known to every member of this house. I refer to the Gamey matter, which was a disgrace

and a discredit to the judges themselves, and the bench of which they were supposed to be honored members.

#### Stuffing Samples

It is not alone in Ontario that we have evidence of this kind, but we have it in the new provinces just formed to the west. We had evidence of it at Regina the other day, where Mr. Laird was elected by a majority, but the ballot boxes were proven to have been stuffed, yet this was legalized by the judge hearing the case. There is a further sample in Prince Albert, where it was necessary to elect a Liberal candidate, and in order to do this men were found who were willing to go out and stuff a couple of ballot boxes to the extent of 150 votes. The ballot boxes were supposed to be used for certain polls, but it was established that polls had never been opened at all. Notwithstanding all that, the fine placed on those individuals was only \$200, and when it was necessary to have the ballots counted in order that the Liberal should be elected, what happened again? If we are to believe the newspapers the ballot boxes had to be taken to a blacksmith's shop and broken open, and the ballots thrown out in the presence of a judge well known in the province of Manitoba. Again what happened? This learned gentleman, notwithstanding all the facts of the case, declared the Liberal candidate elected. ("Shame.")

Let me say here that it will only be necessary to have a few more election trials, and a few more such decisions as those I have described, when the judiciary of this country will occupy the uneenviable position of being despised by the dogs and crows. (Applause.)

#### A Proud Position

I have departed somewhat from my subject and what the leader of the opposition said, but I do not propose to follow him in the details of the various statements which he has made. I am satisfied, and I am sure the members of the house and the people of the country are satisfied with the statement of the provincial treasurer.

During the six years we have been in power we have saved out of ordinary revenue and running the machinery of the country the handsome sum of \$1,200,000 for the people. (Applause.) It is only necessary for us to continue the policy one or two years more, and we will be in the proud position of having saved a sufficient sum to pay the obligations placed on the shoulders of the people by the Greenway government. I ask you what more satisfactory or more gratifying statement than this could it be possible for any provincial treasurer to make in his budget speech? This is sufficient for me to take to the people of the



country, and to establish to them that they are making no mistake when they continue their confidence in the present government. (Applause).

#### **Born Too Late**

And this, too, notwithstanding that we are handicapped as no other province has ever been before. We are handicapped in the first place by being shorn of our lands, timber, minerals, and fisheries, items which in other provinces largely contribute to the revenue. However, we are not fortunate enough to have them. In my opinion as a province we were unfortunately in this regard born too late. We were born at a time when many of the public men of our country had no confidence in our resources, and no hope for our future, and in view of this we were not given that full measure of self-government that it would appear we are entitled to today.

#### **A Desirable Settlement**

If there is one feature of our condition that must be more gratifying than another to the citizens of the country it is the fact that from the day of our creation to the present moment every government that has held office has at all events, no matter what their shortcomings have been, been loyal to the best interests of the province, and loyal in their desire to promote everything that can contribute to the advancement and development of the province which, in turn, they had the honor to represent. Not only have the government been loyal, but the good citizens up and down the country have been loyal, too, and as a result of their loyalty and their pioneer effort they have established the confidence in our country which exists today. Therefore, it has been demonstrated not only to eastern Canada but to our neighbors to the south that there is no country under the sun more desirable for the incoming settler than Manitoba and the Northwest Territories. (Applause.)

#### **Extension of Boundary**

As a result of this advancement two new provinces have been formed. Let me say that with the formation of these two new provinces we naturally felt that our ambition would be gratified at all events to the extending of our boundaries, and given that additional territory for which we have been claiming and for which we have been so unanimous in our demands during past years. It would be idle for me to undertake to recount to the house the number of resolutions which were passed year after year asking the Dominion government to consider our demands in this regard. Last year we felt that the time had arrived when not only should we

pass resolutions, but that they should be followed up by definite action on our part. I am pleased to say that a resolution was not only unanimously passed by this house, but we had the honor of being entrusted by hon. gentlemen opposite as an executive to take the matter before the powers that be at Ottawa, in order that we might hope to secure the extension to which we are entitled.

#### **The Famous Visit**

When this resolution was passed by the house it was at once followed by a definite action on the part of the executive. The first action taken was the following letter written by the provincial secretary,

**Department of the Provincial Secretary, Winnipeg, Man.**

**January 20th, 1905.**

**Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G., President of the King's Privy Council for Canada, Ottawa, Ont.**

Sir,—The government of Manitoba, on a motion of the legislative assembly, has today forwarded to his excellency the governor-general, a memorial relating to the extension of the boundaries of the province, and I am directed to write you and request that you will be pleased to appoint an early date for receiving a deputation from the government of Manitoba in relation to the matter. It would be appreciated if such a date could be named for the first or second week in February.

I have the honor to be sir,

Your obedient servant,

**D. H. McFADDEN,  
Provincial Secretary.**

Sir Wilfrid Laurier replied, date Jan. 24, 1905:

Dear Sir,—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your favor of the 20th inst. informing me that the legislative assembly has forwarded to his excellency the governor-general-in-council, a memorial relating to the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba, and asking to have a date fixed for receiving a deputation from the government of Manitoba in connection with this matter.

The memorial has not yet been received at the office of the privy council. I shall bring your request to the attention of the government as soon as possible after its receipt, and will communicate with you again later on.

Yours very sincerely,

**WILFRID LAURIER.**

**Hon. D. H. McFadden,  
Manitoba.**

Sir Wilfrid Laurier sent the following telegram on Feb. 13: "With reference to your last memorial re extension of limits, will be glad to receive your delegation at any time." Hon D. H. McFadden replied on the same date:

"Referring to your telegram of even

date, Hon. Messrs. Rogers and Campbell have been appointed to confer with your government regarding extension of boundaries. They leave here tomorrow. Will reach Ottawa Thursday, Feb. 16. Kindly notify them at Russell house as to time and place for interview suitable to your own convenience."

Sir Wilfrid's reply, dated Feb. 16, was "Sir Wilfrid Laurier will be glad to receive you tomorrow at 12.30 in his office, privy council chamber. (Signed) Rudolphe Boudreau."

The outcome was that the attorney-general and myself went to Ottawa to plead the cause of the province with Sir Wilfrid Laurier, knowing that, above all others, he had the power vested in him and the government which he controlled, and in order that there should be no misunderstanding this statement was supplemented by us to the effect that the extension of the boundaries as asked for would carry with it no advantage or disadvantage to either political party in this matter. I ask my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, what fairer statement of the position would it be possible for us to have made? We were of course, disappointed with the reply received from Sir Wilfrid Laurier. During our interview we asked, in the first place, that our boundaries should be extended west to Regina and north to Hudson bay, and I think in making this request we were carrying out the wishes of the legislature when that body unanimously instructed us to carry on the negotiations. We were at once told by Sir Wilfrid that there was no use in our talking about expansion west, and to our amazement and disappointment he further told us that that portion of the territory lying immediately north of the province of Manitoba known as Saskatchewan, was to be included in the new province then to be formed.

#### Cash Stopped It

We at once said to Sir Wilfrid Laurier: "If these are your fixed views as to the boundaries of the province you are about to form our mission is at an end and we have nothing further to discuss," and I think in making this statement we would be endorsed by the people of the country. Sir Wilfrid then said, in respect to that territory north of Manitoba, that he would take the matter up with the representatives of the territory who were then in Ottawa, if we would be good enough to wait for four days. What happened? We waited six days, but we got no word from Sir Wilfrid. It is true that during this time we made it our business to find out who the northwest representative was, and it

turned out to be a Dr. Cash. We also made it our business to find out what objections Dr. Cash had to the extension of our boundaries. What do you think we were told? The only reason we heard was simply that Dr. Cash had secured a majority of votes over his opponent in that particular locality, and therefore the ambitions of Manitoba should not, and would not, be gratified in so far as the government at Ottawa was concerned.

#### Sir Wilfrid's View

That is not alone Dr. Cash's view, but it was a view sustained on the floor of parliament by Sir Wilfrid Laurier himself. I am anxious to bring to the attention of the house the position taken by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in order, Mr. Speaker, that you may see that we have nothing whatever to show that he has any intention of giving us that extra territory, even up to the present moment. On Feb. 21, 1905, Sir Wilfrid said in the house of commons: "But I understand that as to a certain portion of territory north of Lake Winnipegosis and Lake Manitoba, the Northwest legislature has declared that it has no pronounced views, and that that might be given to the province of Manitoba. But even this I am not prepared for my part to grant at this moment; because members representing that section today sit on the floor of this house, and they and their people have the right to be heard on that question; and if they do not agree to it, I do not think the parliament of Canada should make the grant against their wishes."

The only reason for that view, as far as we could learn, was that Dr. Cash had a majority over his opponent in this particular locality.

#### Pea-Nut Politics

This is a sample of the pea-nut politics of the Liberal party to deprive the people of Manitoba of the ambition they possess to develop and increase their territory. Furthermore, I would like to quote Sir Wilfrid again. We had an election in the constituency of Mountain, and we were favored during the contest with a visit from a great statesman, a gentleman standing high in the ranks of the Liberal party. He came fresh from the seat of government at Ottawa, and with all the weight of authority which was expected to attach to his advent. He told the intelligent electors of Mountain that he had just arrived from Ottawa, and carried with him the good news that the settlement of the boundary question had been effected, and that we were going to get the extension north that we asked for.

That gentleman was no less a person than Mr. Sam Jackson, M.P. (Laughter.)

**Irresponsible Jackson**

This statement of Mr. Jackson's was brought to the notice of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. What did he say? Did he endorse Jackson's statement? On the contrary, he told the house that he understood Mr. Jackson and two or three other members had a little meeting, but without the knowledge of the government of the day, and that no notice whatever could be taken of their agreement with respect to the extension of the boundaries. On May 9, Sir Wilfrid spoke:

"I could not say anything further than what I have already stated, that it is the intention at some early date, as soon as the provinces are organized, to have a conference of representatives of the provinces of Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, with a view of disposing especially of that section of territory which is now held in reserve, which is part of the present territory of Saskatchewan, but which was not included in the new province of Saskatchewan, and further also in regard to the territory of Keewatin. As is well known by my hon. friend and by members of the house generally, the province of Manitoba claims that they should have the whole of the territory of Keewatin added to their own province. The province of Ontario has, through Mr. Whitney, made a claim, not to that extent, but exacting that no disposal of such territory should be made unless they are consulted in the matter. I understand, and I have reason to believe that the province of Saskatchewan will lay claim to a portion of the territory. Of course, the province of Saskatchewan has no voice in the matter, it cannot speak officially now, but as far as the attitude of those who have a right to speak for it is concerned, I expect that such a claim will be made. As to the disposal of this territory, at the present time, I have no suggestion to offer, and I do not know how far it would be possible for me even to say that I have an opinion in the matter."

**The Only Quarrel**

Sir Wilfrid told us that he would send for us again. We waited for several days, but did not receive the request we anticipated. However, Mr. Campbell received the following letter from another gentleman, his excellency, Mgr. Sbarretti, asking us to meet him, which he did:

"Apostolic Delegation,  
Ottawa, Feb. 20, 1905.

"The Hon. Collin Campbell,

"Attorney-General of Manitoba,  
Russell House, Ottawa.

"Honorable Sir,—I am directed by his excellency Mgr. Sbarretti,

apostolic delegate to Canada, to write to you to say that he would be pleased to see you before your return to Manitoba, if you could find it convenient to come to the delegation. You will kindly let me know, if you can come and when you will be pleased to do so.

"ALFRED A. SINNOTT,

"Secretary.

"Canal Driveway, 2 N. Bank street."

Mgr. Sbarretti requested Mr. Campbell to take back to Manitoba the following clauses, and politely intimated that if we would place this law in force on the statute books of our province, that from the standpoint of view of the Manitoba government some action on these lines would be politically expedient, and tend to facilitate the accomplishment of our object in making the request for an extension of our boundaries:

"Add to section 125.—(b).—And when in any city or town there shall be thirty or more Roman Catholic children, and also thirty or more non-Roman Catholic children or in any village more than fifteen of each of such classes, the trustees, shall, if requested by a petition of parents or guardians of such number of such classes, provide separate accommodation for each of such classes and employ for them respectively Roman Catholic and non-Roman Catholic teachers.

"Add to section 49.—(b).—And when in any district there shall be fifteen or more Roman Catholic children, and fifteen or more non-Roman Catholic children, the trustees shall, if required by a petition of parents or guardians of such number of either of such classes, provide separate accommodation for each of such classes and employ for them respectively Roman Catholic and non-Roman Catholic teachers."

**The Point at Issue**

This is the point at which we take issue, claiming as we do that the question of the establishment of separate schools in this province has nothing whatever to do with the matter of the extension of our boundaries, and in this contention I am sure that we are endorsed alike by Roman Catholics and Protestants in this country, and I am sure there is not to be found in Manitoba one single, solitary Roman Catholic citizen, no matter how anxious he may be for the re-establishment of separate schools, who would come out and take the position that Sir Wilfrid Laurier takes, which is that the extension of our boundaries must be contingent upon the re-establishment of separate schools. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, there is, and there can be, no quarrel either between the government of this country and the Roman Catholics, or between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants of this

province. The only quarrel that exists, and that can exist, is between Sir Wilfrid Laurier as head of the government at Ottawa and the citizens of Manitoba.

We waited at Ottawa a number of days expecting to hear from Sir Wilfrid Laurier again, as promised, but nothing came, and we decided to write him the following letter:

Russell House, Ottawa, Feb. 23, 1905.

Sir,—As we find it necessary to leave Ottawa tomorrow, we desire to refer to our interview of Friday, the 17th, respecting Manitoba's claim for extension of her boundaries westward and northward, when you were good enough to suggest that if we would come here for two or three days you would be in a position to give us an answer respecting same. Up to the present, however, we have heard nothing further from you, excepting your statement in parliament on Tuesday last, when introducing your Autonomy bills, which we presume represents your fixed and final decision as to westward boundary.

In view of Manitoba's very strong claims, as presented to you in the memorial unanimously passed by our legislature, and supported and supplemented in our interview, we must enter, on behalf of the province, our firm protest against your decision in refusing to grant the prayer of our request, extension of our boundaries westward, and exceedingly regret that apparently local considerations have deprived Manitoba of what she rightfully regards as a most just claim.

Respecting extension northward, we most respectfully urge it on you that this should engage your consideration and attention during the present session.

We, of course, most emphatically deny the right of Quebec and Ontario having further to say in respect to the extension of our boundaries north to James Bay, or that they could advance any claim worthy of consideration that would necessitate delay in attaching this territory immediately to Manitoba.

We regard this as exclusively a matter for settlement between your government and Manitoba. We sincerely trust that upon further consideration you may see your way clear to grant the request we make on behalf of a united province.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) R. ROGERS.

We then waited a reasonable time, but no answer came, and we returned home. I then felt it my duty, on behalf of the people of Manitoba to make the statement of facts which I then made. I have nothing to regret and nothing to take back. I simply made a plain statement of the facts, every one of which stands. I made the statement to the public press of this country, and in order that there may be no misunderstanding whatsoever as to my position

and no misunderstanding between myself and my friend the Free Press, I want to say here and now that I wish to be understood as having repeated from my place in this house every single solitary charge which I made at that time as against Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

It is true that Sir Wilfrid Laurier undertook to dispute or controvert the statements I then made, and on which he and friends engaged the attention of the parliament of Canada for two days in undertaking to make a defence of his position. One of the principal points on which he dwelt so much was in fact that my statements must necessarily be all wrong in view of the fact that I made a specific statement that this legislature had passed a resolution year after year asking for an extension of our boundaries similar to that we were then asking for. Sir Wilfrid Laurier undertook to say from his place in the house that in this I was absolutely incorrect, for no request, or no resolution had been received by the parliament of Canada from 1896 down to the present hour. It was only necessary for me to ask Sir Wilfrid Laurier to turn to the journals of the parliament of Canada, over which he appears to have such absolute control, to clearly prove the incorrectness of his defence in this regard, as there he could find the resolution and request previously and unanimously made by this legislature. We were unanimous then in our demands, and I hope we are unanimous today.

#### The Same Conditions

The same conditions exist today, and I now challenge any individual in this country, or any organ representing Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Free Press included, to bring me face to face with one single, solitary syllable of my statements that are not absolutely correct, and in accordance with fact. If anything were necessary to substantiate my statements we had it in the various remarks which fell from hon. members in the parliament of Canada at that time when attempting to supply the defence for Sir Wilfrid Laurier's action. Alluding to that part of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's statement wherein he went on to say that he had pointed out during the interview with my friend the attorney-general and myself, that we should remember that in 1884 Sir John A. Macdonald had refused the extension of our boundaries, I want to say here now, and with all due respect to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, that on this point, as on all others, his memory must indeed be failing him very much, for I am positive that the name of Sir John A. Macdonald was never mentioned during our interview, and certainly nothing respecting the refusal of a request for

the extension of our boundaries on any previous occasion.

#### **Sir William Mulock Scored**

Still greater, Mr. Speaker, was my surprise to find the statement made in support of Sir Wilfrid Laurier by Sir William Mulock. Now, Mr. Speaker, during our interview Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fitzpatrick, the minister of justice, were present, and while we were standing looking closely at a map on the wall, Sir William Mulock entered the room with Senator Choquette, walked over to where we were standing, shook hands with Mr. Campbell and myself, and apologized to Sir Wilfrid Laurier for not being able to remain to take part in the interview. Mr. Fitzpatrick jocularly remarked: "Mulock, you had better remain, as these gentlemen want to take all that territory away immediately north of the province of Ontario." Sir William Mulock simply smiled and retired from the room. Yet, notwithstanding this, he rose in his place in the house of commons and endeavored to make believe that during our interview he had taken strong grounds; in fact, that before any extension of our boundaries could be made the province of Ontario should be heard. It is no doubt within the knowledge of hon. members of the house that very shortly after this time Sir William Mulock was promoted by his leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, to one of the highest positions in his gift, that of chief justice. I say, according to the standard of the Liberal party, he is well qualified for the position.

#### **Criticizing Judges**

We are told by some individuals that we should be very careful to say nothing that will reflect on the judiciary of this country. I say the time has unfortunately passed for that condition of affairs when we see that the qualification for the judiciary of our country has to be considered simply on a par with other applications for positions in any service of the government, viz., that the first question to be considered in connection with such application is to what extent the applicant has served in the counsels of his party, such as the service, and of course, the special service, rendered by Sir William Mulock in this regard in coming so loyally to the assistance of his leader, and even going to the extent of making statements that are absolutely incorrect in order that he might maintain and strengthen Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the continuation of his quibbling, punishing and penalizing policy as against our little province of Manitoba. (Applause.)

#### **A Short Memory**

Sir Wilfrid Laurier showed still further evidence of his failing memory when he undertook to discuss my reference to some of his former statements in the province of Quebec, when up and down that province he had been patting himself on the back until he became round shouldered in describing to the people there the credit to which he was entitled for having effected such a fair and reasonable settlement of the Manitoba school question with Mr. Greenway and Mr. Sifton in the year 1897. Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot do better than quote to you Sir Wilfrid's own words from Hansard, in this regard:

"The only thing I care for is that, whereas, under the act, 1890, they had not the privilege of teaching their own religion in the schools, by the concessions which have been made, whether they are concessions of new rights or a restoration of old rights, they will have the right hereafter of teaching their own religion in the province of Manitoba.

"Well the moment I found that the people of Manitoba were ready to make concessions which practically restored to the Catholics the right of teaching the French language and of teaching their own religion in the schools, I submitted to my fellow countrymen in the province of Quebec that it was far better to obtain those concessions by negotiation than to endeavor to obtain them by means of coercion.

"And I venture at this moment to say that there is not a man in the province of Quebec, there is not a man in this country, who, looking at the settlement unbiassed and unprejudiced, will not come to the conclusion that it was a happy solution of a very difficult situation indeed."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could understand to some extent at all events Sir Wilfrid Laurier's actions today providing the government of this country were guilty of failure on their part to carry out the law as provided for this province by Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1897, and about which he was apparently then so proud. However, I am pleased to note that no charge of failure in this regard as against the government of this province has been made. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, we are sometimes charged with being guilty of being too liberal in our interpretation and administration of this law. As for my own part let me say here and now that I have at all times endeavored to be a good friend to the Roman Catholic people of this province, and Mr. Speaker let me say more, and it is this that I hope I will ever remain as such. We

have no quarrel with the Roman Catholic people, and there is no reason in this matter why any question as between Roman Catholics and Protestants should be discussed at all. What we have to complain of now is simply, and again, Mr. Speaker, allow me to repeat, the attitude as taken by Sir Wilfrid Laurier in that he apparently makes the extension of our boundaries contingent on our re-establishment of separate schools. We refused when at Ottawa to have these two questions settled together, and there is no reason why they should be. Yet we have the direct statement from Sir Wilfrid Laurier's own personal organ in the province of Quebec that such is the case. My friend the attorney-general and myself were aware of the position taken by this organ during our mission at Ottawa, and this was what first created alarm in our minds as to what would be the outcome of that mission. It was pointed out to us that there was apparently no doubt as to the fact that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was absolutely in control of the *Le Soleil* newspaper. The paper itself made the statement clear in the issue of Feb. 11 as follows:

"We declare once for all that *Le Soleil* is the organ of the Liberal party, and by that fact is under the direction and absolute control of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The supporters of Sir Wilfrid and those who affirm themselves to be such, are begged to take notice of the present declaration."

This is the paper that on Feb. 17, the very day on which my friend the attorney-general and myself were having this famous interview with Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fitzpatrick made the following statement:

"In proportion to her big sisters Manitoba will count as little more than a large county."

"This is one of the reasons invoked by Manitoba's delegates to obtain an enlargement of her territory."

"There is another. Quebec and Ontario have extended their limits, the one to the west, the other to the east, to attain on the north the shores of James Bay."

"Manitoba aspires to the shores of Hudson Bay, on the northeast. It would be necessary to withdraw her boundaries several hundred miles towards the north, to cut the district of Saskatchewan and Athabaska, and encircle that of Keewatin."

"Manitoba is asking for treble her existing territory."

"This enlargement is hardly possible."

"The district of Saskatchewan opposes it, at least the part directly interested."

"The finances of Manitoba in their actual state are not made to attract the free residents of the districts. Manitoba has a debt of

\$4,000,000. The school legislation of the little province is not of a nature to attract the immigrants who people the districts. The northwest has its separate schools. Manitoba has abolished them."

"Every good act has its reward, every bad act its chastisement."

"Manitoba will remain lowest with her pretentious law."

#### Why Not Aspire?

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have seen the reasons given by this newspaper why the claims of Manitoba should not be considered. First of all they say that Manitoba aspires to the shores of Hudson Bay upon the northwest, and that in asking for this Manitoba is asking for territory treble her size. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know why we were not justified in this request. In the province of British Columbia they have 350,000 odd square miles, Quebec has 340,000 odd square miles, Ontario has 222,000 odd square miles, Saskatchewan 250,000 odd square miles, and Alberta 250,000 odd square miles, while Manitoba stands a little over 60,000 square miles. I say we are entitled to be on a par with the other provinces, and as such we would not only be entitled to treble the size, but to four times our present size, and then we would be less than the two new provinces formed last year. This paper goes on to say that Saskatchewan opposes the extensions, at least the part directly interested opposes it. We denied when in Ottawa, and we deny now, that Saskatchewan or Ontario should have anything whatever to say in respect to the extension of our boundaries. This is simply a matter between Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his government and the people of Manitoba. However, this statement in *Le Soleil* bears out exactly the position taken by Sir Wilfrid Laurier which I quoted to this house, as made by him on Feb. 21 and May 9 last, and the only reason which we could learn for his readiness to advance the idea that Saskatchewan was opposed to this territory was because he was obliged to acknowledge that the legislature—speaking of the Northwest Territories and with authority in this matter—admitted that they had no objection years before to this territory becoming attached to Manitoba. Yet Sir Wilfrid Laurier was ready to quibble and give this authority not only through his paper, but from his place in the house as a reason why, and the only excuse that we could learn, for his action in this regard while at Ottawa was that Dr. Cash, the member for that territory, objected simply on the ground that he had the good fortune to secure a majority of votes in that locality over his opponent Dr. Patrick.

### Unmanly Statements

The next statement in this newspaper is to the effect that finances of Manitoba in their actual state are not made to attract residents to the district, and that Manitoba has a debt of \$4,000,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, what more unfair, more unmanly statements, could Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his organ be guilty of as against this country than this reference to our financial position, for I want to say here and now Mr. Speaker, that as a province we stand in the proud position today of being able to show that our financial position, notwithstanding the manner in which we have been handicapped and treated, stands equal in the money markets of the world with the financial position of any other province forming part of the confederation of our Dominion. When at any time we find it necessary to place our bonds on the money markets of the world we find them being sought after by financial institutions which look into the soundness of the finances of every country, and we are able to secure as high a rate for our securities as that secured by any other province in any other part of Canada.

### Separate Schools

Then these statements of Le Soleil wind up by the statement that the northwest has had separate schools, and that Manitoba has abolished them, that every good act has its reward and every bad act its chastisement, and that our little province is to remain least of all with our present law. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the condition of which we had to complain, and of which we complain today, we deny the right of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his government to continue their penalizing policy, and punishing us as they are doing. It is true as quoted by Le Soleil that northwest territories had its separate schools, and it is equally true that Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fitzpatrick, the minister of justice, have during the last few months by a course which reflects no credit either on their honor, or upon their standing as public men in this country, taken away from this province that great territory known as Keewatin which was annexed to Manitoba in 1876, and which we have looked after and governed from that time down until the present, and Mr. Speaker, the only reason why they adopted this course was simply for the purpose of establishing a system of separate schools in that great territory. Now, Mr. Speaker, the question is naturally asked how has this been brought about? Let me point out to you in the first place that when the Keewatin act was introduced into the

parliament of Canada, the Hon. Edward Blake, then minister of justice explained its meaning and effect to that parliament, and in so doing he used the following language:

"He pointed out as soon as the boundaries of Ontario and the Northwest territories (meaning Manitoba), was settled, the question would immediately arise whether a portion of the territory for present purposes annexed to Manitoba, would belong to that province. If not annexed to Manitoba it would be under the jurisdiction of the government at Fort Pelly (the then seat of government). If this territory is annexed to Manitoba the laws of that province relating to schools will apply to it. If re-annexed to the Northwest territories, clause 11 of the act of last session will apply."

"Again, on the third reading of the bill, the same gentleman said: 'If the territories were attached to Manitoba, they would be subject to the laws of that province; if to the northwest, they would come under the eleventh clause of the act of last session.' 'I might explain that the clause 11 referred to is the section of the Northwest Territories act empowering and authorizing the establishing of separate schools.'"

So that you can see from this statement, Mr. Speaker, as made by Mr. Blake that when the time should arrive for the disposition of this great Keewatin territory, or any portion thereof, that any part coming under the law of the province of Manitoba would be subject to the school law of this province, and that any part becoming annexed to the Northwest Territories would come under the school law of such territory. Now, Mr. Speaker, what happens? After the province of Saskatchewan was formed and the lines laid down, Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fitzpatrick, the minister of justice, brought in a bill to provide for that very small strip of land of the Northwest Territories which was left out of the province of Saskatchewan and which lay between that province and the territory of Keewatin. Now, this bill provided that that very small portion of the northwest should become attached to the Keewatin district, and let me quote Mr. Fitzpatrick in the house of commons. He said on Wednesday, May 17:

"All the bills that stand in my name on the order paper, as well as the two bills which stand in the name of my hon. friend the minister of the interior (Mr. Oliver), and the one bill which stands in the name of my hon. friend the minister of agriculture (Mr. Fisher), are necessary legislation in view of the autonomy bills that have just been introduced. I might as well, with the permission of the house, explain all the bills at the same time.

By the bill respecting the District of Mackenzie it is proposed to erect into a district, with a constitution based upon that of the District of Keewatin, the territory to the north of the new provinces and extending to the Arctic ocean.

The bill to amend the Keewatin act will add to the present district of Keewatin (1) those parts of the provisional districts of Saskatchewan and Athabaska which are not included in the province of Saskatchewan; (2) the corresponding strip of the present provisional district of Mackenzie which is not to be included in the new district; and (3) the territory lying to the east of the district of Keewatin as now constituted and extending to Hudson bay."

#### A Different Plan

Mr. Speaker, this means that if that portion of the northwest was attached to Keewatin it would come under the control, to certain extent, at all events, of Manitoba, the same as Keewatin has been for thirty years. However, this evidently was not going to suit the purpose of the minister of justice and he discovered a different plan, which he announced to the house of commons on June 20, 1885, in the following words:

"I wish to say that it is my intention to drop bill (No. 157) respecting the district of Mackenzie, and bill (No. 158) to amend the Keewatin act. I do not think these bills will be necessary in view of the amendments which I propose to make to the Northwest Territories act. I am making provision for another system of government than that which we had in contemplation at the time these bills were introduced for that portion of the Territories which remains undisposed of by the autonomy bills. The intention is practically to unite all the Territories, with the exception of Keewatin, under the administration of the governor-in-council. I move that these orders be discharged."

#### A Different Bill

You will observe that he told the house that he was bringing in another bill of a different sort providing for the government of this northwest territory other than that of connecting it with Keewatin. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, he distinctly made clear to the house that this Keewatin territory was to be exempt from the operation of this act, and further than that in his own act as passed and assented to on July 20, 1905, he makes it clear that the Keewatin district is to be exempt from the operation of this act, and let me, Mr. Speaker, quote the act itself in order that there may be no misunderstanding:

#### 4-5 Edward VII.

##### Chap. 27.

An Act to amend the Act Respecting the Northwest Territories, (Assented to 20th July, 1905.)

His majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the senate and house of commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

1. This act may be cited as the Northwest Territories Amendment act, 1905.

2. The expression "the said act" in this act shall mean the Northwest Territories act and all amendments thereto.

3. The Northwest Territories shall hereafter comprise the territories formerly known as Rupert's Land and the Northwestern Territory, except such portions thereof as form the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, the district of Keewatin and the Yukon Territory, together with all British Territories and possessions in North America and all islands adjacent to any such territories or possessions except the colony of Newfoundland and its dependencies.

#### Double Dealing

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope I have made it clear to this house and I trust clear to the people of this country, that in every statement, and even in the act itself, there was no doubt or uncertainty in so far as it could be made clear by Mr. Fitzpatrick by his own words or by legislation of the parliament of Canada, that the legislation he was introducing entirely exempted the district of Keewatin from its operation. Yet what do we find happens? And this is where I say that Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fitzpatrick are guilty of the charge of the most serious double dealing that has ever been laid at the door of any public men in this Dominion of Canada. And what do you think, Mr. Speaker, they do? After all the evidence which I have presented to you, and the trouble to which they appear to have gone to make it clear to the house as I said before that the Keewatin district was exempt from the operation of Mr. Fitzpatrick's legislation, they undertook four days after the passing of the act which I have just quoted to issue a proclamation in the official organ, the Canada Gazette, under which they deliberately removed and took from our province of Manitoba all our rights and all our claims which we had to the Keewatin district as a result of our managing the affairs of that great territory for thirty long years.

#### How Is It Possible

Now, Mr. Speaker, you naturally ask how this could be possible. Well, sir, it was accomplished in this way: In the old act governing the Keewatin district the following clause appeared:



"Provided always, that the governor-in-council may, by proclamation published in the Canada Gazette, at any time when it appears to the public advantage to do so, detach any portion of the said district therefrom and re-annex it to that part of the Northwest Territories of Canada not included in the said district; and the portion so detached shall then be subject to the same government and laws as that part of the Northwest Territories of Canada to which it is re-annexed."

#### The Public Advantage!

Now, Mr. Speaker, you will observe that at any time when it appears to be to the public advantage of Canada, a portion of the Keewatin territory, not it all mark you, could be detached from Keewatin and attached to the Northwest Territories. But, Mr. Speaker, even this had to be done when such an act could appear to be in the public interest. Now, sir, what position does this leave Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his minister of justice in? It leaves them in this position, that they themselves, by their own statement on the floor of parliament, by their own act passed on July 20, declared that it was not in the public interest that this territory should become attached to that portion of the Northwest Territories which was then being disposed of. And yet, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding this declaration in the Canada Gazette, they took advantage of an unfair interpretation of this clause to rob Manitoba of this great territory. And for what purpose, Mr. Speaker? No doubt for the purpose which is named in the latter part of the clause in which it says that the portion so detached shall then be subject to the same government and laws as that part of the Northwest Territories of Canada to which it is reannexed.

#### What It Means

Now what does this mean, Mr. Speaker, in so far as our position is concerned? I cannot do better, perhaps, than quote to this house the interpretation, meaning, and effect as laid down by Sir Wilfrid Laurier himself. When discussing the autonomy bills on May 9, he took the position that—

"No; there is no need of a legislature, because there is no population. Keewatin has been administered for thirty years by the province of Manitoba."

And further:—

"I take the position that the constitution makes it imperative for us to respect separate schools wherever they exist."

#### Double School Law

What does this mean, Mr. Speaker? It clearly means that whatever extension of our boundaries we may get, if we

ever get any according to the principle as laid down by Sir Wilfrid Laurier we must, and under no other terms can it be possible for us to secure an extension of our boundaries without first our accepting the principle of separate schools in that territory. Therefore our position will be simply this in so far apparently as it is possible for Sir Wilfrid Laurier to make it, that should we even now get an extension, it would be necessary to have a double school law, one for the territory so added and the law as it exists at the present time in this province. All this quibbling of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's can carry with it no other interpretation. The difficulties which he anticipates with respect to the objections as offered by Dr. Cash for that district north of this province, as well as his desire to have Ontario lay claim to a portion of this Keewatin territory, carries with it the same meaning. We denied last year, and we deny now, the right of Ontario to have anything whatever to say in regard to this matter, for the simple reason that when we had our dispute with Ontario in 1883-4 in respect to the eastern boundary, and when the matter was carried to the judicial committee of the privy council and finally settled, and in which as you all know we were unfortunate enough to lose that very valuable territory lying east between the present boundary and Thunder bay, yet, sir, the public records go to show that at that time with Sir Oliver Mowatt as leader of the government of Ontario a request was made to the secretary of state for the Dominion of Canada to have the northern boundary of the province of Ontario where it stands today, finally fixed then and forever. The Dominion government accepted this request as made by the government of the province of Ontario, confirmed the request and forwarded the same to the house of commons of Canada for their confirmation. Therefore by their own act and their own request the northern boundaries of the province of Ontario have been fixed for all time, and Ontario has no standing to make any request. It is true that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, if he wishes, for reasons of his own, and for reasons no doubt which I have described, desires to give them the territory north of their present boundary, he can give it. As I have stated, Mr. Speaker, already, Sir Wilfrid Laurier has full and complete power in his own hands and the hands of the government to alter this boundary just when he likes, and to what extent he wishes.

#### Little Reason to Hope

But, Mr. Speaker, according to Sir

Wilfrid Laurier's recent attitude towards this province, we have little reason to hope for anything that will be of benefit to us at the hands of the government at Ottawa. We have the open, clear, distinct, declaration as made by Sir Wilfrid Laurier's own personal organ, and about this, Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt, because we had the evidence of it most clear and distinct just a few days ago as to the absolute control and management of *Le Soleil* newspaper by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. They had a little row, Mr. Speaker, of their own in the province of Quebec when Senator Choquette was evidently offended by Sir Wilfrid Laurier's interference in a municipal contest in which he was engaged. Sir Wilfrid sent the following telegram:

"I have refused up to the present to interfere in the municipal contest in Quebec, but in view of the complicated conditions of the situation, I think that in the general interest of the party you should withdraw your candidature."

To which Senator Choquette replied: "At your request and as you say in the interests of the party, I retire from the municipal contest. I desire also to return to you the control and direction of *Le Soleil*."

### Well Established

Therefore I think I have established to this house and to this country a statement clear, full and complete in effect that Sir Wilfrid Laurier is undoubtedly responsible and answerable for the utterance of every syllable appearing in that newspaper. Thank heaven, Mr. Speaker, the day is not far off when no public man in Canada, either through his own organ or by his actions, can continue to regard the good citizens of our little province simply as bastard members in the confederation of our great Dominion. We ask for no favors. We look for none. We expect none. We want none. We have pleaded for simple justice and fair play. This for the present has been denied us. We may for the present have to wait a while, but not long. It is true we may have to wait to see the present administration at Ottawa politically dead and politically damned. When this day arrives and a Conservative administration rises in their place, we can then depend as citizens of the province upon securing equal liberty, equal rights and equal fair play in common with all other good citizens in all other provinces that now form the great confederation of our grand Dominion of Canada. (Loud applause.)



